

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 44 and 63 were pending in the application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 20, and 32, and cancelled claims 2, 16 – 19, 21, 33, and 63. Accordingly, claims 1, 3 – 15, 20, 22 – 32, and 34 – 44 remain pending in the application.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure over certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification accordingly. The Examiner’s objection to claim 33 is believed moot in light of Applicants’ cancellation of claim 33.

Claims 1 – 4, 6, 7, 9 – 11, 13, 20 – 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32 – 34, 36 – 39, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mittler (USPN 6,686,847). Claims 5, 8, 12, 14, 15, 23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 35, 40, and 42 – 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mittler. Claim 63 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mittler in view of Koo (USPN 6,684,338).

Mittler teaches a single LED combined with a dark-colored reflective cavity, a diffusing graphic overlay, and a dark tinted window to provide a backlit indicator. (Abstract) More specifically, Mittler teaches that “the indicator can be used outdoors and under conditions of limited power. For example, the indicator may be part of a customer terminal mounted outdoors at retail establishments, such as gasoline stations.” (col. 1, lines 63 – 37) Koo teaches a multicolor light emitting diode which can change color to indicate two different modes of a computer system. (col. 6, lines 29 – 37)

However, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Koo or Mittler, either separately or in combination, of “a logo capable of glowing,” as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

In addition, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that it would have been obvious “to include a dual color LED in the system of Mittler for the purpose of

displaying a multitude of computer states,” since Mittler does not teach a computer system having multiple states.

Accordingly, claim 1, along with its dependent claims 3 – 15, is believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art. Claims 20 and 32 recite similar limitations, and are thus believed, along with their respective dependent claims, to also patentably distinguish over the cited art.

No fees are believed necessary; however, if any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5681-45200.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin  
Reg. No. 33,929  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P. O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(512) 853-8800  
Date: 9-8-04